

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### AFGHANISTAN: IN TO WIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, right now, people are fighting and dying for a free Afghanistan. They deserve an answer to the crux of the matter: Are we in to win? I believe we must be.

My answer stems from a broad strategic vision focused by three fundamental principles: One, America's security is from strength, not surrender; two, our greatest strength rests in expanding liberty to the oppressed to ensure freedom for ourselves; and three, we are targets of tyrants and terrorists not because of our actions but because of our existence.

Helping the Afghans free themselves from the Taliban's tyranny and al Qaeda's terrorism is a moral good unto itself. To retreat from or compromise this noble goal in the cause of human freedom will not only be a betrayal of the Afghans, it will endanger our own birth right as a free people.

Our allies, our rivals, and especially our enemies will witness our lack of conviction; and, by so dishonoring ourselves, we will squander our allies' trust, lose our rivals' respect, and incur our enemy's emboldened depravities.

Our primary nation-state enemy, Iran, imperviously continues its pursuit of nuclear weapons and the means to wield them. A defeat in Afghanistan will condemn generations yet born to the capricious terrorism of an Iranian regime protected by a nuclear umbrella. Alternately, victory in Afghanistan will further Iran's necessary containment by democracies opposed to terrorism.

Unable to expand its sway, Iran's ability to coax our rivals into opposing sanctions and, worse, aiding its nuclear pursuits, will ebb and end; and, within its own borders, the regime will falter and, like the Soviet Union, ultimately implode between the weight of its own oppressed people's aspirations for freedom.

Regarding Afghanistan particularly, General Stanley McChrystal has affirmed victory remains within reach. What form will it take? My view is the richly diversified people of Afghanistan desire a decentralized democracy that is opposed to terrorism and is engaged with their neighbors and allies.

To this end, America, NATO, and the U.N. must renounce the recent fraudulent election and schedule a scrupulously monitored, honest election. This is essential to reassuring the Afghans that their nascent representative government and the coalition's intentions in their homeland are legitimate and benevolent.

As this process proceeds at pace, we must make clear the new democracy's governing principle is local control. Every Nation, especially one as tribal as Afghanistan, has traditional roots of order springing from and connecting the individual and family to the local community and larger country. Without an enduring history of or trust in a centralized, bureaucratized rule from Kabul, only an explicit, enduring commitment to local control will soothe the Afghans' resistance to their federal government's existence. Moreover, local control also intermeshes with coalition forces' counterinsurgency operation.

Emulating General David Petraeus' brilliant counterinsurgency strategy in Iraq, coalition forces must be increased to provide the force necessary to defeat the enemy's violence and intimidation of Afghans. As the security situation is stabilized, coalition forces and steadily increasing Afghan national police and army personnel must live amongst the people to facilitate sustainable local economic developments and democratic institutions. In sum, the coalition will separate Afghans from the enemy by concretely proving the moral and practical superiority of locally rooted democracy over nihilistic terrorism and tyranny.

Importantly, reconstruction efforts must not be limited to Afghanistan. With the enemy infesting western tribal regions of Pakistan, the coalition must also engage with that nation's people and government in "preemptive reconstruction." Rolling blackouts, food shortages, and other persistent problems affecting Pakistanis must be ameliorated at the national and, critically, the local levels. This will stop Pakistanis from viewing themselves as unwilling conscripts into a "proxy army" being used by the coalition; it will stabilize Pakistan's Government; it will demonstrate the coalition's commitment to the well-being of Pakistani citizens; and will empower the Pakistani army to more actively and effectively coordinate with coalition forces to eradicate the enemy's safe havens in their Nation—safe havens which, I note, constitute an existential threat to democracy in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Surrounded by free Afghans and coalition forces, the enemy will be uprooted from its havens with nowhere to hide and will be crushed.

This is the synopsis of the broader strategic context and immediate recommendations of those who support victory in Afghanistan. May we all ever remember America's greatest security as liberty, and let us pray the Obama administration supports Gen-

eral McChrystal's plan for victory so that we and future generations in this world never confront the prospect of a wider war and endless threat from abandoning Afghanistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE MACKAY FAMILY: PART III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I think I do tonight the end of what is a trilogy. I have been here on three nights talking about a family in my community. Two nights ago, I introduced this body to the Mackay family; a doctor, respected, board-certified orthopedic surgeon of 30 years in the community, who has been alleged by the Drug Enforcement Administration of having given improper prescriptions to his patients.

Last night, I explained what happened to this family, as 20 members, armed, in uniform, came in and held him at bay for 4 hours as they searched his home and office and took all his records, his books, his car, his truck, all his cash, his savings, and even his retirement account.

□ 1630

I told how his family had nothing and lived on their food storage for a while until 5 months later they finally went to court and had some of their property returned. But the Federal Government still has the truck and all his books, as well as his savings and checking account, and has yet to make a charge or arrest this individual. It is now 15 months later.

Today I finish the story. The Drug Enforcement Agency did offer a deal to this good doctor saying they would drop everything and it would all go away if he would simply surrender his license to practice medicine. Thinking he has done nothing wrong, he refused that offer. In March, the DEA started the procedures to remove his license from him.

The administrative law judge, a judge of the executive branch, hired by and working for the Drug Enforcement Agency to make quasi-judicial decisions on the actions of that agency, decided to hold a hearing on his license and insisted that everyone had to come from Utah back here to Washington, D.C. A local court said that was silly and ordered the hearing to take place in Utah. The judge, somewhat piqued at that, should have, to make sure there was no element of antagonism or question about it, recused himself as he was requested. Nonetheless, he did preside over that hearing.

The doctor, because he still has the chance of judicial action hanging over his head, was advised by his attorney to answer all questions by taking the Fifth Amendment. Now I don't want to say what I think should be the case on his license. That is still being reviewed and is yet to be officially decided by the DEA. Nor do I think I have the competence to make a lot of these decisions. What I do know is that, in my opinion, this doctor is no threat to the community. That opinion is backed up by the majority of the physicians in the community whose sworn depositions say the same thing.

I do know that this family, since June of 2008, has been terrorized, his profession destroyed, reputation besmirched and his property confiscated. Yes, he went back to court to get some of it back, but why did he have to do that? Yes, if the DEA decides to take his license, he can go to court to have that overturned as well, but why should he have to do that? Justice, if it is to be there, should be a justice that works quickly so that he is charged, he goes before a jury of his peers and a conviction or an acquittal takes place. This nightmare of delay is nothing more than that for this poor family.

Now the good part of this message is this is an isolated case. This is not the way most things happen. The bad part of this message is this is not a unique case. Other times this same thing has happened. Citizens should not be treated in this way. It's simply the wrong way to do it. The Mackay family deserves all of his resources returned to him until such time as a conviction does take place. He also deserves some kind of an apology, neither of which I have the power to do. But I do have the power to at least express my sympathies for one of my constituents whom I do not think has been treated well. And if as a representative of my constituents I cannot at least do that, I have no more value in this particular body.

This ends the trilogy of this particular family. It does not end the nightmare of this family. I hope it can end soon for their benefit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### MOVE THE VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS BILL NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, in 1620, 102 Pilgrims and a crew of approximately 25 people left England on the Mayflower to escape religious oppression. After an arduous 66-day journey

plagued by disease, they landed on the shore of Plymouth and founded this great Nation.

The story of the Mayflower is a symbol of the struggle against religious oppression, and the symbol still resonates in the hearts and minds of the American people today. But this struggle for religious freedom did not end with the Mayflower. The struggle continues today worldwide in countries such as Tibet, China, the Sudan and Vietnam. Two days ago, I had the great honor of speaking to His Holiness the Dalai Lama. He encouraged the U.S. Congress to continue speaking out against religious oppression and to stand up and defend the values that founded our great Nation. This is what I'm doing today.

Madam Speaker, the country that I would like to challenge today, and have done many times previously, is Vietnam. Vietnam, for decades, has exemplified religious and human rights oppression. And this image today has not changed. Since receiving its preferred status and being selected a member of the World Trade Organization, Vietnam's record on human rights and religious freedom has gotten worse rather than better. This regression is well documented by Human Rights Watch as well as by the Commission on Religious Freedom.

Madam Speaker, let me briefly outline for you what the Vietnamese Government has done. Ten years ago, the Vietnamese Ministry of Labor, War Invalids, and Social Affairs directly oversaw and operated two state-owned labor companies that were involved in the largest human trafficking case ever prosecuted by the U.S. Department of Justice. The High Court of American Samoa rendered a judgment against the Vietnamese Government in the amount of \$3.5 million, and they have yet to pay.

Recently, the Vietnamese Government assaulted, arrested and imprisoned dozens of Catholics in the Diocese of Vinh for erecting a temporary place of worship on Tam Toa Parish Church that was destroyed during the Vietnam war. They attacked the parishioners of Thai Ha Parish as they were conducting a prayer service. They then arrested and wrongfully prosecuted church members for inciting riot. They imprisoned Father Nguyen Van Ly, put the Venerable Thich Quang Do under house arrest, and forced members of Protestant churches to renounce their faith. They arrested and imprisoned human rights activists such as Le Cong Dinh, Le Thi Cong Nhan, and Nguyen Van Dai for criticizing the government. They forcefully evicted 400 Buddhist monks and nuns from Bat Nha Temple and shut down the monastery without just cause.

These are just a few examples of the outrageous and egregious actions taken by the Vietnamese Government recently in violation of every principle of justice and fairness. If these examples are not sufficient to draw our at-

tention and condemnation, I do not know what will.

Unfortunately for these oppressed people, our world today does not allow them to simply leave their country to establish a country of freedom elsewhere. That is why they need the assistance of a country like ours, the most powerful democratic country in the world, to speak on their behalf.

We must speak loudly by passing the Vietnam Human Rights Bill. The longer we wait, the longer people like Venerable Thich Quang Do, Father Nguyen Van Ly, Mr. Le Cong Dinh and countless others like them will continue to suffer.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM—ONE GIRL'S TESTIMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The House bill to have government take over health care contains section 2511 which would put clinics in our schools. Minnesota has experience with these clinics.

Here is one girl's testimony:

"Hi. My name is Jamie. I hope my personal story and experience with the West Suburban Teen Clinic will convince you that bringing this clinic into the school campus will endanger the health of many students.

"At age 14, I was what you could describe as a rebellious teen. My parents had rules, like all parents, and tried their best to instill moral values in my life they hoped would guide me down the right road. But I chose a path that led to the West Suburban Teen Clinic. It was there I learned how easy it was to get birth control, morning-after pills, exams, condoms, or whatever else I needed to have sex and not tell my parents. I didn't even have to go to a real doctor.

"At the clinic, I was told my parents didn't have to know about any of my visits or what birth control the school clinic was giving me. The clinic made it so easy for me to have sex. They made it so easy to hide things from my mom and dad. After all, since it was my right not to tell them about birth control, they didn't need to know anything else about my life either. The teen clinic opened the door for me to lie and supported me in my deception. Looking back, I can see that their counseling affirmed a continuous pattern of lying, secrets, and cover-up. This destroyed any mutual trust between my parents and me.

"The West Suburban Teen Clinic convinced me I was doing a good thing by going there because I was practicing safe sex. Was it safe to break the trust with the only people who really truly protected and cared about me? Was it safe when the clinic jumped at the chance to give the morning-after pill to a 14-year-old without revealing to